

Serial No. 10/065,480
Filed: 10/22/02
Page 2 of 2

Examiner: Bibi Sharidan Carrillo
Group Art Unit: 1746

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed March 16, 2005, restriction was required between claims 1-29, drawn to a method and claims 30-63 drawn to an extraction cleaner. This restriction requirement is respectfully traversed.

Applicants disagree with the Examiner that the process claimed can be practiced by another materially different apparatus which does not require a dispensing nozzle. Application of a heated cleaning fluid with a dispensing nozzle is not materially different from applying heated cleaning solution to a surface to be cleaned. All extraction cleaners have this configuration. Applicants disagree with the Examiner that the process of claim 1 can be practiced by a emersion.

Applicant provisionally elects Group 1, claims 1-29. As a matter of clarification, the undersigned attorney had a telephone interview Examiner Snyder on January 30, 2005, at which time Applicants elected, with traverse, claims 1-29 in the above-identified patent application.

Action on the merits is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Eric J. Hansen and Thomas K. Ankney

Dated: 3-28-05

By: 

John E. McGarry, Reg. No. 22,360
MCGARRY BAIR PC
171 Monroe Avenue, NW, Suite 600
Grand Rapids, Michigan 49503
616-742-3500

G0163011